

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

**Question 10 Reference: ATPD Page 44    Paragraph # 4.7.9**

Title: Emission Certification

Statement: This paragraph requires "To determine conformance to 3.2.1.10, the contractor shall certify that the vehicle (all variants) comply with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Regulations governing control for Air Pollution from New Vehicles and New Motor Vehicle Engines in effect on the date of sale of the vehicle."

"C.2.4.1. The contractor shall comply with all federal vehicle safety, noise and emission requirements and standards, hereinafter referred to as requirements, affecting the supplies delivered IAW ATPD 2131C, Attachment 1 and in affect at the time of contract award. The FMTV trucks shall, however, comply with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emission regulations/standards for new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines in affect for calendar year 2004 at the time of award with the exception of the X1140 HIMARS Launcher Chassis."

"H.2 Environmental Protection Agency National Security Exemption(40CFR85.1708). The Contractor shall be required within ninety (90) days of contract award, to submit a letter to the Environmental Protection Agency through TACOM requesting the transfer of TACOM's National Security Exemption to insure that EPA emission standards in effect at the time of award will be the applicable standard for all vehicles produced under this multiyear contract, including any option vehicles."

**Question 10A:** If the transfer of the TACOM exemption is denied and the EPA refuses to grant any new exemption, what contract mechanism is in place for a vehicle configuration and price adjustment based on the new requirements.

**Answer 10A:** *Pursuant to C.2.4.2, last line: "Any change to the trucks mandated by post award changes in law or regulation that had not been scheduled to take effect during the term of the contract at the time of contract award shall be subject to an equitable adjustment." In the unlikely event EPA refuses to grant a National Security Exemption which would allow the manufacturer to apply standards in effect at the time of award to all vehicles produced under the contract, including option vehicles, the contractor would be entitled to an equitable adjustment in contract price if compliance with post-award EPA emission standards changes resulted in increased costs of performance. Any changes that might be required would be done by contract modification.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

**Question 10B:** Does the phrase date of sale, in paragraph 4.7.9, refer to the initial date of sale (signed DD250) for vehicles produced during Low Rate Initial Production (LRIP) prior to the completion of PVT and the First Article Test (FAT) acceptance?

**Answer 10B:** *Yes, the date of sale is the initial date of the signed DD250. LRIP is a term that does not apply to the FMTV CR Program because it is follow-on production.*

**Question 10C:** Will the Government provide the applicable approved emission certification waiver for the XM1140 HIMARS launchers produced in this contract?

**Answer 10C:** *Yes, 40CFR - Chapter I - Part 89 covering military combat vehicles allows TACOM to declare the specific vehicles that will be exempt.*

**Question 13 Reference ATPD Page 72      Paragraph # B.3.1.8**

Title: Volcano Mine Dispensing System

Statement: Paragraph B.3.1.8 states that "The dump truck shall be equipped with provisions to mount and operate the Volcano Mine Dispensing System." The M139 Volcano Multiple Delivery Mine System was mentioned as a desired requirement in the "Final Report on the Improved Dump Bed Assembly on the FMTV 5-Ton Dump Truck" provided as Attachment 40 of the Phase I FMTV A1CR contract. This report contains no specific information on this system nor does it document that it has been successfully tested in the M1090A1/M1094A1 FMTV Dump Trucks.

**Question 13A:** Has this system ever been evaluated in the FMTV dump either during this improved dump bed testing that occurred at Fort Leonard Wood or at any other time?

**Answer 13A:** *Other than demonstrating the physical interface of the Volcano and its mounting kit, no validation testing has been performed.*

**Question 13B:** If it has been tested, does the redesigned bed / dump variant incorporate the necessary features to secure and operate the mine delivery system?

**Answer 13B:** *The redesigned dump bed (which is the current production configuration) has the same mounting/tiedown provisions and no interface impacts are anticipated.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

**Question 13C:** If it has been tested, can the contracting agency provide a copy of the test report / application approval for this system to be used on the FMTV Dumps?

**Answer 13C:** *No test report exists.*

**Question 13D:** If it has not been tested, can the necessary interfaces/space requirements be provided so this requirement can be confirmed on the new configuration dump variant?

**REVISED Answer 13D:** *Tiedown kits are not to be provided with the vehicles under this contract, unless the Contractor is changing location of the tiedown rings from the Contractor's current configuration.*

**Question 13E:** Are there any variations to the type and quantity of other modules that need to be carried in the dump bed to meet current or proposed JSOR requirements?

**Answer 13E:** *The only other "module" required by the current or proposed JSOR/ORD is the provisions for a troop seat kit capable of carrying up to 12 soldiers (six per side).*

**Question 25, Reference ATPD Page 13**

**Paragraph # 3.2.2.3.3**

Title: Corrosion Control Performance

**Statement:**

There were numerous recommended changes described in the Accelerated Corrosion Durability Test of the FMTV in Attachment 25. Many of these have been incorporated via ECP's provided for information during the Phase I effort of the program.

**Question 25A:** Have all the recommended changes proposed in the subject corrosion test report been incorporated into the new TDP provided in this draft RFP?

If not, and the configuration baseline is in effect frozen, please provide a list of the corrosion enhancements still outstanding that need to be incorporated.

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

**Answer 25A:** *Those changes that the Government has elected to incorporate are already reflected in the TDP. No additional changes (Phase II or otherwise) are envisioned at this time.*

**Question 25B:** If the recommended changes have not been incorporated into the baseline TDP, will these become new Government mandated changes that must be incorporated in the Phase II proposal?

**Answer 25B:** *No additional changes resulting from the ACT are envisioned at this time.*

**Question 65, No Reference**

**Question 65A:** Do we use the existing drawings and number sequence we have in the A1 CR database (vault) we created?

**Answer 65A:** *Yes, the contractor should use the drawings provided with the draft RFP for actions prior to contract award.)*

**Question 65B:** Do we have to include drawings with any ECP submittals?

**Answer 65B:** *Yes, drawings (or mark-ups in the case of revisions to existing drawings) must be submitted with the ECP submittals, per contract requirements.*

**Question 65C:** Are all ECPs to be formally packaged, IAW Attach. 6? or just those that have a change since last submitted (TWADs)?

**Answer 65C:** *Attachment 6 provides instructions for preparing all ECPs.*

**Question 65D:** What does supporting documentation mean (i.e., TM markups, individual impact statement sheets etc.), that are normally part of an ECP?

**Answer 65D:** *As a minimum, the Offeror is to provide those items that spell out the effects the proposed change has on any of the various support areas (i.e. Logistics, Engineering, TMs, Provisioning, Packaging, HFE, Safety, etc.). The Offeror must also provide a statement indicating those support areas where no impact is anticipated.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

*Additionally, the Offeror may provide, at their discretion, any supporting documentation that would support their change as proposed. This could include vendor data sheets, results of vendor/contractor testing, material specifications, computer models and simulations, and/or any other information that Offeror believes will aid in the evaluation of the proposed change.*

**Question 89, Reference ATPD, Page 1**

**Paragraph # 3.4.1.2**

Title: Heavy-Duty Cooling System

**Statement:**

The GVW of the Expansible Van is listed as 36,176 lbs, just 169 lbs lighter than the Wrecker, which is listed at 36,345 lbs. However, the cooling requirements vary greatly – the Expansible Van being subject to 0.6TE/GVW requirement, while the Wrecker is required to cool at 0.55TE/GVW.

**Question 89:**

To keep the performance characteristics of the variants constant, shouldn't the Expansible Van be subject to the same cooling requirements as the Wrecker?

**REVISED Answer 89:** *The tractive effort (TE) for the Expansible Van will remain at 0.6 TE/GVW, as currently stated in the ATPD. While the van has a similar GVW as the tractor and wrecker, the GCW and mission profile of the van is substantially different. It is the long, slow pulling/towing at GCW that resulted in the reduction of the tractor/wrecker requirement. As the van does not operate under these conditions, there is no need to reduce the full load cooling requirement.*

**Question 105, Reference ATPD, Page 108**

**Paragraph # H.3.3.2**

Title: Cold Conditions

**Statement:**

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

“For outside temperatures less than -25°F to -50°F, a temperature of at least 60°F shall be obtainable within 60 minutes after the heater is turned on. A kit is allowable to meet this requirement.”

**Question 105A:**

Has there been any evaluation to confirm that the baseline heater for the LMTV Van either meets or does not meet this requirement?

**Answer 105A:** *Yes, the heater was successfully tested during PQT (Test Report ATC-7750, Jan 96).*

**Question 105B:**

If testing has been performed, will the competitors be provided a copy of the test results for review? If so, when would this information be made available?

**Answer 105B:** *Not required. See response to 105D below.*

**Question 105C:**

If the baseline heater cannot meet this performance requirement, is there an existing kit that is to be used with the LMTV Van and if so will details be provided to the contractors?

**Answer 105C:** *Beyond the baseline installation kit (57K1948) there is no supplemental kit for the additional heating requirement.*

**Question 105D:**

If no information is provided about this kit, are the competitors responsible to develop a kit to meet the Cold Condition requirement?

**REVISED Answer 105D:** *The Offerors are not required to develop a kit to meet this requirement. Prior testing has shown that the heater meets the requirement. Should the baseline heater not provide adequate performance in future testing, it would be addressed post-award through an STS initiative.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

Title: Tiedown Kits

**Statement:**

No specific information has previously been provided on these kits and they were not included in the Draft RFP TDP provided?

**Question 111:**

When will a drawing package of these respective kits be provided to the competitors to insure no incompatibility with any proposed ECP?

**Answer 111:**

*Tiedown kits are not required unless the Contractor is changing location of the tiedown rings from the current A1 configuration.*

**Question 119, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.2.1.1.1.2**

Title: Compatibility with A1/A0 TDP

**Statement:**

C.2.1.1.1.2 “the contractor shall identify within the PPEPs/RFDs/RFWs/ECPs/VECPs generated under Program Support and/or STS of this contact whether the proposed change is compatible with the FMTV A1/A0 TDP and currently fielded FMTV A1/A0 vehicles.”

**Question 119A:**

Will the government provide an accurate electronic Bill of Material in spreadsheet, ASCII text, or other usable electronic format for the FMTV A0 TDP?

**Answer 119A:**

*No, the Government will not provide a "Bill of Material". After contract award, the Contractor will have full access to ACMS, the Government's configuration repository and this information will be available.*

**Question 119B:**

Will the government provide an accurate, audited drawing TDP for the A0 vehicles?

**Answer 119B:**

*After contract award, the Contractor will have full access to the Government TDP for the A0 vehicles. The Government will not provide a separate "audited drawing TDP".*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

**Question 153, Reference Draft RFP A.2.3**

**Statement:** Reference is made to system requirements that are controlled by another document, the FMTV JSOR that is currently in staffing.

**Question 153A:** Please provide an estimate of JSOR approval or a date after which the Contractor is not responsible for changes driven by the outcome of the JSOR.

**Answer 153A:** *The ORD (JSOR) is expected to be approved on or about 9 Aug 02. All requirements which the Contractor will be responsible for are included in the ATPD 2131C which will be issued with the Final RFP.*

**Question 153B:** What is cut-off date for changes to ATPD 2131C in support of FMTV A1 CR Phase II proposal?

**Answer 153B:** *The Cut-off date for changes from the Draft RFP will be 30 days prior to release of the final CR Phase II proposal, to allow the Government time to incorporate potential changes into the Final RFP and ATPD 2131C. All changes expected to result from the approved JSOR have been discussed with the Contractors and will be included in the Final RFP.*

**Question 252: Reference ATPD, Page N/A**

**Paragraph # N/A**

Title: N/A

**Question 252:** Review of drawing 12422013 provided with the latest TDP resulted in a conflict between the current drawing and a prior submittal within a TACOM ECP. The following outlines the discrepancies. Can the Government determine which drawing revisions are considered the latest intended for the TDP to be used in the bid and proposal process and provide this information?

Drawing 12422013 sheet 1

- Drawing provided with ECP U5746, revision D block states:  
    "Revised IAW D718  
    1-2) See Sheet 2"
- Drawing provided with the latest TDP, revision D block states:



**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

“Revised Revision status of sheets block  
ERR TACU3009”

Drawing 12422013 sheet 2

- Drawing provided with ECP U5746, revision D block states:  
    “Revised IAW D718  
    1) Revised part No. for find 38 from 12414419-039 to 12414419-041.  
    2) Added optional part no. 12422568 to find 3”
- Drawing provided with the latest TDP, revision D block states:  
    “Revised IAW Dev D718  
    1) 12414419-041 was 14214419-039  
    Revised IAW 6878  
    2) 12422568-001 was 12378453  
    3) 12414419-042 was 12414419-041  
    ERR SSS-R6878”

**Answer 252:** *This issue is being resolved by the Government, and Contractors will be updated when more information is available.*

**Question 287, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.1.5**

Title: N/A

**Statement:**

The third sentence states “The contractor shall furnish 3D Solid Models of the Contractor baseline vehicles within 240 days after contract award for cargo trucks (M1078A1, M1083A1, and M1084A1) and within 300 days after contract award for all other models.” The Government has advised the competitors that the baseline TDP is being modeled in Pro-E (3D and 2D models) for all FMTV variants. The date that the completed Pro-E 3D/2D models will be released to the contractors, however, is not certain. We understand that the intent is to have the Phase II production contractor integrate their ECPs into the baseline 3D/2D vehicle models. Consequently, it is necessary that the contractor have the Government Pro-E modeled TDP before starting the ECP integration.

Since the integration work is contingent on having a baseline TDP to start with, the contractor due dates should be tied to the dates that the baseline Pro-E TDP are furnished

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

by the Government. The wording of the RFP section C.1.5 should be modified as annotated below:

**Suggested wording for this paragraph (*blue/italic text denotes changes*):**

**The FMTV TDP, Attachment 2, is being converted to “Pro/ENGINEER” 3D Solid Models. The Government shall provide the Contractor with the 3D Solid Models of the Government baseline vehicle, Attachment 39. The Contractor shall submit modeling and simulation data of their changes to the M1085A1 without winch, M1087A1 without winch, M1088A1 with winch, M1089A1 and M1090A1 with winch IAW CDRL A001. *The contractor shall furnish 3D Solid Models of the Contractor Phase II changes to the M1078A1, M1083A1, and M1084A1 within 240 days after contract award or receipt of the Government provided 3D Solid Models of the Government baseline vehicle, whichever is later. The 3D Solid Models of the Contractor Phase II changes for truck models M1079, M1082, and M1095 shall be furnished within 300 days after contract award or receipt of the Government provided 3D Solid Models, whichever is later. Government baseline is defined in section C.1.6.4.1.* The Contractor shall have computer software and hardware necessary to use/manipulate/incorporate changes to the 3D Solid Model. All Contractor 3D Solid Models shall be submitted to the Government in Pro/ENGINEER format IAW Section C.2.1.1.4 of this contract.**

**Question 287:**

Will the Government consider making the suggested schedule clarification?

**REVISED Answer 287:** *Yes, the wording of this section shall be changed to read as follows, "The FMTV TDP, Attachment 2, is being converted to “Pro/ENGINEER” 3D Solid Models. The Government shall provide the Contractor with the 3D Solid Models of the Government baseline vehicle, Attachment 39. The Contractor shall submit modeling and simulation data of their changes to the M1085A1 without winch, M1087A1 without winch, M1088A1 with winch, M1089A1 and M1090A1 with winch IAW CDRL A001. The contractor shall furnish 3D Solid Models of the M1078A1, M1083A1, and M1084A1 within 240 days after contract award or receipt of the Government provided 3D Solid Models of the Government baseline vehicle, whichever is later. Contractor shall furnish 3D Solid Models of the M1085A1 without winch, M1087A1 without winch, M1088A1 with winch, M1089A1 and M1090A within 300 days after contract award or receipt of the Government provided 3D Solid Models, whichever is later. Government baseline is defined in section C.1.6.4.1."*

**Question 290, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.2.4.1**

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

Title: Pre-Production Engineering Proposals

**Statement:**

“C.2.2.4.1 .....This paragraph requires the Contractor to correct those deficiencies to technical documentation without any equitable adjustment in the contract price or delivery schedule under the “Changes” clause or any other clause except as is otherwise provided in this clause.”

“C.2.2.4.5 Upon Government approval of a PPEP, the Contractor’s obligations as relates to such PPEP shall be discharged to the extent that the deficiency is corrected in all vehicles produced under this contract. If the incorporation of such approved PPEP does not correct the deficiency, the Contractor shall yet remain responsible for resubmitting a request for further changes to the technical data without increase in contract price or extension in delivery schedule and incorporate such PPE change as approved into the contract items not yet accepted by the Government.”

The current language requires the contractor to provide an updated TDPRCP from the Phase I contract with the Phase II proposal (L.2.2.2.1). The current language also states that the contractor shall provide PPEP’s incorporating the TDPRCPs into the TDP 90 DAC (C.1.2.8). As review of the TDP continues and as the build of the Phase II test vehicles occur, more errors within the TDP are expected to be uncovered. These errors will cause the TDPRCP list to expand beyond that submitted within the Phase II proposal.

**Question 290A:**

Will the TDPRCP be allowed to continue during the build of the Phase II test vehicles to correct deficiencies within the TDP, especially for variants not built under A1CR Phase I contract?

**Answer 290A:** *The suggestion to extend the period of submittal for the PPEPs to through production of the Phase II test vehicles is under review. The final RFP may be revised to incorporate this suggestion.*

**Question 290B:**

The errors within the TDP were not generated by the contractors involved in the FMTV A1CR Phase I program. Since the ultimate quantity of existing TDP errors is unknown, the Phase II contract awarded should not be obligated to correct the TDP at no-cost under Program Support for FMTV A1CR. If so, the PPEP process will be used to update the current TDP to correct the deficiencies noted in the TDPRCPs. Will the 90 DAC

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

requirement in C.1.2.8 be extended to allow PPEPs to be processed throughout the build prior to FPVI.

**Answer 290B:** *See answer 290A..*

**Question 299, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.4.1**

Title: Safety

**Statement:**

Paragraph C.2.4.1 states that “The Contractor shall comply with all federal vehicle safety, noise and emissions requirements and standards, hereinafter referred to as requirements, affecting the supplies to be delivered IAW ATPD 2131C, Attachment 1 and in effect at the time of contract award”.

Government response to Phase 1 RFP question “EN-A04” stated the following: “Per Title 49 CFR 571.7 (c), Military Vehicles are exempt from Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS), and therefore, no waiver of FMVSS standards is necessary. FMVSS standards are incorporated on a selective basis in the FMTV vehicle specification. To the best of our knowledge, neither FMVSS or EPA data plate requirements are applicable to the FMTV vehicle system, and contractors will not be required to install such data plates in either Phase I or Phase II of the Competitive Rebuy acquisition.”

The word “all” in the phrase “comply with all federal vehicle safety ...” within the C.2.4.1 paragraph creates some potential confusion and/or conflict with the previous Government directive found in question EN -A04.

**Question 299A:**

Can the Government confirm that the FMTV does not currently, nor is it required to, meet all FMVSS and EPA standards?

**Revised Answer 299A:** *The FMTV does not currently meet all FMVSS standards. It is only required that it meet those FMVSS standards selectively incorporated into the ATPD. With the exception of the EPA requirement for data plates, the FMTV must meet **all** applicable EPA noise and emission standards and, unlike FMVSS, the FMTV does not fall under any general EPA exemptions or exclusions from regulatory requirements.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET I**

**12 Jul 02**

**Question 299B:**

Can the Government confirm that only those FMVSS and EPA standard requirements that are specifically addressed in Section 3 of the ATPD and the associated variant specific ATPD Annexes apply to the FMTV Competitive Rebuy program?

**Revised Answer 299B:** *Vehicles produced under the FMTV CR Program must meet all FMVSS standards expressly referenced in ATPD 2131C and Annexes thereof. Vehicles produced under the FMTV CR Program must meet all applicable EPA noise and emission requirements specified in Government regulations. It is the contractor's responsibility as the vehicle manufacturer to determine the applicability of EPA noise and emission requirements.*

**Question 299C:**

Can the Government confirm that the answer to the Phase I question EN-A04 is still true and relates to the Phase II production contract?

**Revised Answer 299C:** *Yes, but only to the extent it is further explained and clarified in A and B above.*

**Question 299D:**

Will the Government consider clarifying paragraph C.2.4.1 by replacing the word “all” in the first sentence with the phrase “all ATPD applicable” federal vehicle safety, noise and emissions requirements and standards?

**Revised Answer 299D:** *Yes, but only to the extent that the "all ATPD applicable" applies only to FMVSS. With regard to EPA noise and emissions standards and requirements, it is still "all applicable" as determined by the vehicle manufacturer.*